

REMARKS

Claims 19-24 and 27-36 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Forman (U.S. Patent No. 4,279,469). The Office Action asserts that Forman teaches each and every feature of the invention including at least one rigid component 38 adapted to grip a sleeve 42 of a signal line 12 wherein the gripping means includes a spring element 28 made of a flexible material which engages and exerts a biasing force on the rigid component and away from the signal line to remove load of or loads on the rigid component. The gripping means can be released or partially released from the signal line. The signal line is influenced by loads on the signal line and the signal line passes in a smooth line in the gripping means.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

The present invention relates to a sensor system, intended for flexible gripping *allowing for displacement of the gripped cable* by external forces in order to distort the signal in the cable. This distortion can be detected, making the gripping means according to the invention suitable for a sensor system. Note especially page 1, lines 6-24 and page 1, line 30, page 2, line 10. Claim 19 also states that the signal line is embodied such that *the signal that is fed through the line can be influenced by loads exerted externally on the cable*. This distortion occurs without influence by the gripping means, which include a rigid component, as the gripping means comprise a spring element to remove the load of this rigid component from the signal line.

Forman is directed to a cable connector for joining optically the respective terminal ends of one or more pairs of glass fiber optic cables. See col. 1, lines 11-14 of the reference. This cable connector, for joining the cable ends, is designed to *prevent displacement by external forces* in order to minimize degradation of the signals. Accordingly, the cable connector of Forman achieves the exact opposite result as the present invention. Forman is not suitable for acting as a sensor and is, in fact, concerned with rigid fixing of a connection of optical cables to prevent signal distortion. The connector of Forman is aimed at gripping and protecting the cable from any distortions as much as possible and, therefore, cannot be relied upon for achieving the goal of the present invention, nor would it lead one having ordinary skill in the art to redesign this cable-protective connector into a gripping means which improves the distortion of the cable.

The connector of Forman is concerned with permanent fixation and stabilization of the position of the optical cables. Evidence of this is shown at col. 1, lines 46-50 of Forman, which states that the alignment sleeves enable precise and **rigid** alignment of the cables joined therein. The resilient collar permits transverse adjustments only during the mating of the connector parts, not during use in the connected state. Col. 2, lines 39-50 of Forman states that the sleeve 38 is made of metal (which would not allow for any distortion of the cable), and states that the sleeve 38 **rigidly** supports the terminal end of the cables (col. 2, line 43).

The connector of Forman also contains a resilient collar 28; however, this collar 28 serves to axially align the cables during mating (col. 2, lines 42-46). After mating the cable ends, the resilient collar 28 serves to absorb shock forces (col. 2, lines 46-48) and does, therefore, not enhance sensitivity towards external pressure, but reduces it. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the statement of the Office Action that the signal line in Forman is influenced by loads on the signal line.

As set forth above, the Forman connector protects the optical cable from external forces, and prevents distortion of signals, making it unsuitable for use as an effective sensor. In contrast thereto, the gripping means of the present invention are dedicated to ensuring that a force on the cable held by the gripping means induces a detectable distortion in the signal carried by the cable. Since the gripping means of the present invention enhance this distortion and, therefore, enable a greater sensitivity, significant advantages can be achieved through their use in security and/or detection systems.

In view of the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully requested that the final rejection of claims 19-24 and 27-36 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn as Forman fails to anticipate each and every feature of the claims as the connector of Forman is unsuitable as a sensor and is aimed towards an opposite purpose of a sensor. Additionally, it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the connector of Forman to achieve the present invention as such would require significant modification thereof. There is no suggestion within Forman that hints towards use of the connector as a sensor, nor any adjustments that could possibly adapt the disclosed connector toward such purpose.

Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forman in view of Hinze U.S. Patent No. 5,703,754). Hinze is relied upon as teaching materials having a hardness of between 10-100 shores. Hinze fails to overcome the

deficiencies of the Forman connector. Hinze shows adhesive sealants as materials used for construction of a circuit board and are, thus, covered by the compound, a Shore hardness of 40-50 after curing of the sealant are preferred (col. 3, lines 34-35). The function of this hardness is apparently to make the board tamper deterrent and tamper evident (col. 3, line 42). This implies that the cured sealant has a lack of resilience, as resilient materials would come back to their original form after a tampering attempt.

Moreover, as stated above, the combination of Forman with Hinze would not lead to the invention as recited in base claim 19, as the gripping means of the present invention is still lacking in Forman.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully requested that the final rejection of claims 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn as the combination of Forman with Hinze fails to render these claims obvious.


CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of pending claims 19-36 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By



John W. McIlvaine
Registration No. 34,219
Attorney for Applicant
436 Seventh Avenue
700 Koppers Building
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Telephone: (412) 471-8815
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com